## TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

DRIGINAL

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

MEETING OF

THE

NATIONAL PETROLEUM COUNCIL

Washington, D. C.

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

Stenotype Reporters
444 North Capitol Street
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 347-3700
Nationwide Coverage

800-336-6646

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

25

7450 01 01

P-™ Wpv

## PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN COX: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the meeting of the Petroleum Council. You have an agenda before you. We will try to follow that. We appreciate the excellent turnout we have. You are always wonderful to respond to the meetings, and we are delighted you are here.

Now, if you have no objection, the check-in at the door will serve as the roster count and the attendance check and we will not call the roll at this time.

I did want to point out there is one person missing. Many of you have noticed maybe this morning -- and I know you have over the years -- there was always a familiar face sitting at the front door greeting us as you entered the room. Wylie Whisonant missed only one meeting of this council since it was established in 1946 until he became ill earlier this year. Wylie had been an employee of the Department of the Interior, where he assisted every Secretary of the Interior from 1936 until he retired in 1971.

Following his retirement, he joined the National Petroleum Council staff. He was an inspiration to all. He passed away on March 6 of this year at the age of 84. I am sure he will be missed by all because he was always so nice and friendly and greeted us as we came in.

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

νq₩™q

. 9

Therefore, with sincere appreciation for his

achievements and contribution to the industry and the council, and with a sense of great loss, be it resolved on this 28th day of October 1987 that the deepest sympathy of the members of the National Petroleum Council be extended to his widow, Virginia, and the family of Wylie Whisonant, that this be entered upon the permanent record of the council, and that an appropriate copy be delivered to his family as a remembrance of the council's esteem and deep appreciation.

Ladies and gentlemen, if you would not mind, I propose that we signify adoption of this resolution by rising for a moment in silent reflection and prayer.

(Pause.)

CHAIRMAN COX: Thank you very much.

You all know the people at the head table. But I would like to introduce, on my left, Lod Cook, vice chairman of the council. Next to Lod is J. Allen Wampler, assistant secretary for fossil energy. At my far right, Marshall W. Nichols, executive director of the council. Next to Marshall is Bill Swales, chairman of the NPC committee on petroleum storage and transportation.

On my immediate right, as we all know, is the Honorable John S. Herrington.

We are very pleased, Mr. Secretary, that you could join us this morning for our first item of business.

*F*™pv

We are always delighted to hear from you.

I am also pleased to announce that the Secretary has agreed to answer any questions and comments after his remarks. So we will open it for questions at that time.

It is a pleasure, Mr. Secretary, to introduce you at this time.

SECRETARY HERRINGTON: Thank you.

(Applause.)

SECRETARY HERRINGTON: Thanks, Ed. This is a little different atmosphere than there was last year at this same time, I think most of you will agree. I remember Bobby Parker was hunting down at his ranch, deer hunting — I forget who he was with, one of the guys in this room. They had shot a deer, and they were dragging it out to the truck. They had the truck pretty far out in the brush there, and they dragged it by the hind feet and they were pulling it toward the truck and the antlers were catching in the ground and catching in the brush and hooking in the trees as they were going out.

And they were working up a sweat. This was a heavy deer. They were really getting a little tired, and they met one of the ranch hands there on the way out. He said, "Mr. Parker, I think it would go easier if you would drag this deer by the antlers," and he said, "then you wouldn't be digging in the dirt and hooking the brush."

*P*™Wpv

So he -- and I forget, it might have been Ray, I'm not sure.

(Laughter.)

SECRETARY HERRINGTON: They walked around and grabbed the deer by the antlers and started pulling it.

They went a little distance. They looked at each other and said, "Yes, this is much better. We're not getting any problems here. But Bob said, "You know, there's only one thing that bothers me about this." Ray said, "What?" And he said, "Well, we're getting farther and farther from the car."

(Laughter.)

SECRETARY HERRINGTON: Isn't that true story? (Laughter.)

SECRETARY HERRINGTON: I think, you know, we're still pulling the deer. We're still pulling the deer. We're pulling in the right way now. We haven't quite reached the car. Policies are changing. Things are looking at little better. We have got a long way to go, still.

I think there has been a lot of energy debate in the country, in the Congress, in the industry. Certainly, we have everybody's attention. I brought an example of that, the energy security study. The President has now reached fame and fortune. It has been now been translated into Japanese, and they have sold more copies than we have.

P" Wpv

We are on our third printing, 20,000; and I think they are substantially over that. So this is obviously the sign of success.

I wanted to talk about a couple of things this morning and the maybe take some comments and questions that you would be interested in.

Obviously, the number one issue on everybody's lips today is the economy: What has been going on? How does that affect what we have been doing, our policies? What does it mean for oil import tax; is that back on the table? How are we going to deal with all of this?

I have just returned from a visit to eight countries in the Gulf. I thought I would talk about that a little bit. We spent about two weeks over there. We met with the leader of every country, every energy minister, every finance minister, every prime minister. We went from Turkey to Kuwait to UAE to Bahrain to Quatar, Saudi Arabia, Morocco, and obviously, Egypt.

The number one issue obviously is the Gulf from top to bottom over there: what is happening, what is going to happen, how do we see it. The question that I think was most often asked was does the United States mean it? Are we there for keeps?

There is a great deal of skepticism on the part of every foreign leader over there. Our record, of course,

F-Wpv

following through with commitments with the Shah of Iran and other incidents is not the best. We have a democracy, and we tend to change policies in the middle of the stream sometimes.

And we have a number of countries over there that are operating with what I would like to call a gun held to their head. They are sitting very close to a belligerent nation with 40 to 50 million people that basically, from my impression of what was said by most of the leaders over there, there is very little coordination of policy in the government of Iran. There is very little authority of government officials. People are not authorized to say certain things. Very few issues go to the Ayatollah, and there is general disorganization within the hierarchy of that country.

Almost every moderate country in the Gulf has attempted to reach out to Iran to try to be a middleman or negotiate peace, without results. Certainly, the U.S. has used every contact that we know possible through the State Department, Defense Department, National Security Council, and we have not been able to begin the kind of talk that needs to happen.

The best hope, and I think the desire of most countries, would be to have a negotiated peace settlement through Resolution 598 in the U.N., and then a follow-on

₽₹Wpv

resolution of arms embargo. That would be, I think, the most desirous solution to it.

In the interim, you have noticed that the President has signed an oil embargo against Iran. Actually, it is more than just an oil embargo. It has hit stronger than that. It has hit some of the other products that we are purchasing and exporting to them.

We also have some initiatives underway to link the sale of Silkworm missiles from China with some high-tech equipment that they have been purchasing from us.

So we are making every effort to settle this before it gets out of control.

The President's reasons for the oil embargo, I think, are several. They have been pretty clear. The first, I guess the most important one, is the unprovoked attacks on the merchant vessels that are working in the international waters. That is a situation that is intolerable for the United States.

The second reason that he has talked about is a refusal to implement this U.N. Security Council Resolution 598.

The third, continued aggression against nonbelligerent nations in the Gulf.

The fourth, what we know today to be a sponsorship of terrorism from that country elsewhere in the

₽~ Wpv

world outside of the Gulf. It really is a sad scenario that is taking place.

Where are we? 1986, we purchased \$600 million -\$500 million worth of petroleum -- from Iran in the U.S.,
and \$100 million worth of other products. In the first
months of 1987, January to July, we purchased over \$1
billion from them.

The question comes up many times in my discussions: First of all, is the embargo effective? We have all lived through embargoes now. We watched the attempts with the Olympic boycott, which didn't work too well. The grain embargo, we didn't get anywhere with that.

The South African sanctions, I think, have been a dismal failure. They have not accomplished, and we knew they did not. All they have done is create some millionaires in South Africa who have purchased distress sales and lost a lot of jobs, and I think it jeopardized our foreign policy in that area.

Embargoes are tough. Economically, they don't make sense. They are hard to administer.

That said, I don't think we can afford as a country not to take the step to prevent this amount of money flowing into a government that will purchase arms to be used against our men and women in the Service. So we must take that step.

₽₹₩pv

The Senate voted 98-0 in favor of an embargo.

The House, I think, was almost unanimous, five votes against it. And the President feels strongly on it.

That said, and since we are now embarked on that particular course, the success of an embargo will depend on how we approach it as an industry. For international companies it will depend on what kind of cooperation we get from our allies. If we cannot get cooperation from countries like Japan, West Germany, Italy, other large purchasers of oil in this market, then it will not be successful.

For that reason, the Japanese -- especially the Japanese -- must do their part in this embargo to get the war wound down. We averaged in 1986 90,000 barrels a day of oil from Iran to the U.S. and to our territories, 250,000 barrels a day in the first seven months of 1987. Then during July -- I think you read the figures in the paper -- 620,000 barrels a day.

We have begun to wind that down, and in August of 1987 we estimate about 468,000 barrels a day in August. And then we are down to, in September, our estimates are 345,000 barrels a day. That is a substantial amount of oil.

That said, we area still only getting between there and five percent of American oil out of the Gulf from imports, which is not a large amount. The Japanese are

₽~₹ Wp∨

still pulling on the average of about, I would say, a third of the oil out of the Gulf. It is costly for us to convoy in the Gulf. We are risking American Service personnel. The figures are large on our expense of patrolling the Gulf. The Japanese have so far put together \$10 million in navigational systems. They have granted some loans to some of the Gulf countries, and they have been supportive in the U.N. I think we can expect and we must expect them to do more.

That is a subject that we can talk about in a minute if you care to. It is certainly one that is on our number one list.

It is obvious to me after talking to oil ministers -- I spent two hours with King Fahd, time with his Saud, and it is pretty obvious that they are going to try very hard to support a price of \$18 in the Gulf regardless of circumstances. They are committed to it. It will be difficult at the December meeting that they are having in Europe. But it looks to me like they are set on the policy, for those of you who are interested in price.

In the meantime, it is interesting to note -- and I think most of you follow this -- but in the recent events in the stock market we have not seen the price of oil move too much this last week. The biggest fluctuation was about 40 cents that I saw. I have been asked over and over again

*P*™Wpv

are the events in the Gulf contributing to the stock market dislocation in the United States. My answer is that I don't think they are. Maybe in the short term maybe they have. Maybe they have a cumulative effect a little bit, a little bit working in there, but on a short-term basis only.

I think investment decisions can depend on a lot of things. But I find it difficult to believe that events in the Gulf have been one of the major driving forces.

I was reading up to 90 days ago in investor magazines like Russell and Dow Theory that we are into a bull market -- I am sorry, a bear market and that the change had taken place. And I think investment decisions were made far beyond some of the events that took place in the Gulf. A number of you are active in the market and may have different ideas. That is the way I see it from where I sit.

We have an interesting situation now. The President, the administration, the Congress are getting together to attempt to negotiate some changes in deficits, which I think will be very helpful, I think we all agree. The Maguire Institute has decided they are coming to Washington. They will take a full-time job and help us on this. We had quite a discussion last night. And I appreciate that. I am being a little bit facetious. But obviously, this is a subject that is on everyone's mind.

I was asked yesterday is the oil fee back on the

₽ T Wpv

table. Let me try to address that. The President said everything is back on the table. And I would say we have to take him at his word, that everything is back on the table.

That said, my personal opinion is that the oil import fee probably ranks pretty low on the list of things back on the table. And for this reason, the dislocation that has taken place in the securities industry, the banking community, severely hits the financial markets.

I don't know what you do with a country like Mexico that owes us \$100 billion. If you go back to the oil import fee, how do you put it back on imports from Mexico with the amount of money they owe our community? It looks counterproductive in that particular area.

We have just entered into a free trade agreement between the U.S. and Canada. The number one part of that agreement, and I would like to talk about it a minute, is the energy sector. Canada is our biggest supplier of imported oil today, and if you went back to import fee, I don't know what you would do with a situation with Canada. You certainly cannot go in the face of the free trade agreement with an import fee. It is specifically prohibited.

So if you knock out Canada and Mexico, I don't see the impact of the import fee. I think there are better places to look.

*F*→ Wpv

So I am still not of a mind to encourage anyone that the oil import fee is a viable situation again.

I have looked at Bill Hogan's Harvard report which was put together. He shows a positive scenario for the oil import fee, but he makes the assumption that all the money you collect will go back directly into the economy, which is nonsense. It would be used for deficit reduction. I think that is living in another world, on a realistic basis.

So I will stand by the analysis that we have put in the energy security study that you saw come out in February. I will reference you to page 72, which is the oil import fee discussion if you have it to look at again. I believe that analysis is still pretty sound.

I think we have had some progress in stability of price. Price has been pretty stable between \$18 and \$20.

My personal feeling from what I see is that that will continue.

People say, "Herrington, what about the fact that the oil embargo is going to force Iran to drive prices down and they will discount heavily, especially if Japan and other countries participate in the embargo?" I think that will give you a little bit of downward pressure. I can't help but think that after talking to King Fahd and the other leaders, leaders in Kuwait and President Zaid, that they

₽₹Wpv

2,3

will go to great lengths to defend the \$18 price and that will dominate the market.

What have we done inside the administration?

Besides work on the tax credit, you saw the letter from the President last year. The administration may have had something to do with the rig count. We have worked hard on the windfall profits tax. I am encouraged by what I see. I think we have a general consensus that the windfall profits is a disaster; it is not a productive area for the administration on federal policy.

I am making a general statement because I think it took us a long time to get to that realization. I see people like Chairman Dingell, who now have recognized publicly and privately that the windfall profits tax is probably not a good idea.

There are problems. It is attached to the trade bill. The trade bill is a difficult bill. There is no question in my mind that if it stays in its present form, the President is going to have real difficulty signing it. But then again, we haven't seen the final form and we are still working to address the trade bill down to something we can live with. The trade bill today is a tremendously protectionist bill, and it will not help the economy of the U.S. It is attached to the reconciliation bill. I don't care what it is attached to, the windfall profits tax needs

,P⊶™ Wpv

to go. It is a good signal, and we will keep working on that particular area.

We have worked very hard on the report from EPA to Congress from the Department of Energy, the Department of the Interior. It has been a joint effort on production waste. We have had a lot of help from API and a number of you in the industry, and I think we have made a lot of progress in this particular area. And I think that some of these unreasonable production regulations will be eliminated. And I am very pleased to see that.

We are making progress in resolving the ERA cases. We are settling more and more of those cases. We still plan to be able to abolish that particular program by the time we leave office. Hopefully, I will be there to turn out the lights.

Some of the cases are still difficult, but mainly we are getting good response from the industry, good reasonableness, and lawyers are working hard with us on our side and on their side, and we have reached some pretty reasonable settlements in that area.

ANWR, obviously, this is an area that has been very interesting to some of the majors. ANWR, I think, looks encouraging. I was encouraged last summer with the amount of people that got up to visit North Slope. I think we got key people up there. I liked the discussion. The

F™ Wpv

1.3

Porcupine caribou issue seems to be going away. And we see efforts to bring in other issues, which means that maybe the Porcupine caribou issue is not the driving force this time. I would like to see us get away from that particular issue.

I would like to talk a second about the free trade agreement. I think this is on your mind. The free trade agreement is something that will be controversial in some areas. But from where I look at it, virtually all barriers to energy trade will be removed between the U.S. and Canada.

And I have been asked questions: are we going to affect FERC's authority through this particular free trade agreement? My answer is no. As-billed has been preserved. Current levels of trade are unaffected, and we don't have many barriers today. And this will prohibit us from erecting barriers.

I see this agreement as a model for the hemisphere. I think it is being underrated. If you really look at the implications of a free trade energy pact between the U.S. and Canada, it will make a lot of energy available at competitive prices. It is going to encourage the use of gas a lot, and I think that will be good for both sides. It is not going to affect programs to preserve and enhance reserve bases. If the U.S. Government wants to put incentives in for exploration and development, we can still

*F*-₹Wpv

do that and not be in violation of the agreement. And Canada can do likewise. So incentives are still there.

It is going to stop the dumping of cheap subsidized gas or any other kind of hydroelectric power on the U.S. market, and I think that is good for American producers. I would say that the free trade agreement is going to do a lot to stimulate gas production in the U.S. and in Canada and gas use.

The agreement, I think, from what we look at, if we could use it with more countries, it might come closer to establishing more of an interrelated energy market in this hemisphere.

So I like what I see on it, and I know a number of you are supportive, and some of you asked some questions. Let's see if I have finished before I open it up for questions here.

One other thing that I would like to mention is that we did receive from you the energy security report that was put together, called "Factors Affecting U.S. Oil and Gas Outlook." It came from EAB, Energy Advisory Board. We had the geoscience research energy security, and we have the advanced exploratory research report, Energy Council, oil, gas, shale, and we had the National Petroleum Council's report on factors affecting U.S. oil and gas outlook in the U.S.

vqW <sup>1-q</sup>

We had a lot of reports that have come through. We have a lot of information. And what are we doing about it?

One of the things I have done is I have created, along with Allen -- and I hope that you who have not gotten to know Allen Wampler and dealt with his department, know how receptive he has been to the industry and how much he has done in organizing the fossil area, especially in the oil and gas area. But together, Allen and I have created the office of geoscience research in his office of assistant secretary, which I think will do a lot towards bringing together research.

We have established a Department of Energy hydrocarbon geoscience research coordinating committee that will attempt to coordinate all of our geoscience research.

Council requesting you to address the petroleum research institute. It is a bit controversial. Some people have responded hat they don't want it because of the technology proprietary information traits. But what we ask you to do is to look at it to see if there is a place that we can help in working together with recovery technologies, if we can do anything to move together with the industry to help in the area of research and development and recovery.

C.J. Silas is proposed as chairman. He will have

PT Wpv

their first meeting November 8 in Chicago. Those of you who are asked to participate, I hope that you will have some input because I think it can be valuable if it is structured right.

Again, we are not looking for a federal solution to your problems. We are only looking to be helpful, to see if we can assist the industry and assist some of these programs and pull with you rather than at opposite ends.

I think that is about all I have to talk about in a general nature. I would be happy to try to take specific comments if they are necessary. But those are my general remarks. Thank you.

(Applause.)

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

ア・Wbur

5

CHAIRMAN COX: Why don't we just open it up for questions and whoever would like to start off?

MR. GONZALES: This Administration inherited a very difficult energy situation because of the past mistakes made in energy policy. It is to be congratulated for the progress it has made, but as you recognized in your opening statements, we still have some things that need to be done.

The recent developments that emphasize the need for improvement in the national energy policies include the following:

The cost of U.S. Naval operations to protect shipments of oil in the Middle East.

The needed and long-term advantage to the nation of the 1986 energy price shock, the third in 14 years, caused by the action of oil exporting countries.

And the increasing costs of the Strategic

Petroleum Reserve as it continues to be built up at the rate
the Congress proposes.

In this situation we need to take some action to improve energy security which would be in accord with the sound principles, that appropriate fees should be levied to provide revenue to pay for what the federal government has to spend to deal with these problems.

Now, I agree with you that it would be nice if we could depend on a free market, but it is perfectly clear

アWbur

1

3

2

5

6 7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

from the violent fluctuations in price that occurred between 1985 and 1987, when there were very slight changes in the world demand and supply of petroleum, that the price of oil is subject to manipulation by exporting countries.

In that situation we have to ask ourselves what can be done to face up to the problem.

Now, in 1970, Secretary Schulz was the Chairman of the Cabinet Task Force on Oil Import Controls, in which the committee said:

"We recommend establishment of an absolute maximum for tariffrestricted Eastern Hemisphere oil imports equal to 10 percent of domestic demand."

It also recommended that should there be in excess of 10 percent of projected domestic demand from this area import licenses should be auctioned.

I agree with you that we should not impose a tariff on imports from Mexico and Canada or any place in the Western Hemisphere, but our problems have arisen from imports from the Eastern Hemisphere, a distant source, and because that is the cause of our need for a Strategic Petroleum Reserve, naval operations in the Persian Gulf, and so forth, it would be appropriate to levy a national security fee on oil imported from the Eastern Hemisphere

PIWbur

only, including all products made from crude oil from that hemisphere.

A small fee of only 5 cents a gallon, which is \$2.10 a barrel, would have very little impact on the price, but it would signal the intention of the United States to recognize the cost, the hidden economic cost of depending on oil from distant sources.

And we could also announce that we would continue to exercise that fee until imports from that area dropped to the level indicated by the Cabinet, and this needs to be studied from an economic standpoint, and I hope that the Administration in the final period that it has will recognize what a great contribution could be made by taking some positive steps to show its concern about the risks involved in depending so heavily on oil imports from the Middle East.

SECRETARY HERRINGTON: You made some very good points, and I think those are the ones that we are wrestling with now.

I don't know if you accept my hypothesis that the dependence of the U.S. is not as heavy on the Middle East.

I stated we only depend upon 3 to 5 percent. I think the main problem is the dependence of our allies on the Mideast and, in addition, the interlocking nature of our economies, and since we all know this is a world market, it is not a

ም<sup>ጚ</sup> Wbur

1 2

U.S.-Mideast market, the Strategic Petroleum Reserve I think has been a big factor -- it was mentioned in the Mideast when I was there a lot, and they want to know when we are going to use it.

How big it is. It is up to 535 million barrels today, and our policy is still firm to use it early on in an oil shock, and I think we are not backing off that particular policy, but I think you have made some good points.

I am not sure that there is a uniform agreement on that type of a fee, but I would be interested in a show of hands in this group. This is a group of very knowledgeable people, experts in the field, economists, lawyers, producers.

The type of fee that has been described obviously is a surcharge directed against one particular sector of the world market, and I would be interested for my own information how many in this room think that type of proposal would be a good thing.

Would you mind raising your hands? (Show of hands.)

SECRETARY HERRINGTON: We get about four hands.

How many think it would not be a good thing?

(Show of hands.)

SECRETARY HERRINGTON: We get a lot of hands.

, Wbur

How many are undecided?

(Show of hands.)

SECRETARY HERRINGTON: We get a lot of hands on that.

And I think that is the problem. We are such an interrelated market today it is a very difficult particular area. The question that is hard for me to answer is why is the U.S. spending — our costs today in the Gulf for the convoy is from 20— to \$30 million a month out of the Navy budget and risking American lives on ships where we are only importing 3 to 5 percent from that area. Why aren't our allies doing more? Why isn't Japan financing our whole convoy operation when they are taking one—third of the oil, and why do we have an oil embargo against Iran and Japan is still purchasing one—third of their oil from Iran? Aren't we working at cross purposes?

Those are very difficult questions that we have to get to in the next few months, and we have to insist on more support for our operations and more support for what we are doing in that particular area.

It is pretty obvious, I think, that this war needs to come to an end, and it needs to come to a peaceful solution or it must confined out of the international waters. We simply cannot stand for the principle of allowing American flagships or even, in my estimation,

P-™Wbur

American-owned ships, while they may not be American flagged, to be subjected to a belligerent nation that is traveling the sea lanes at will, machine gunning targets of opportunity.

Another question?

MR. CALDER: You express the opinion that the free trade bill with Canada would elicit greater production of gas.

Would you please give me the scenario of projected events that led you to come up with this opinion?

SECRETARY HERRINGTON: My opinions as a businessman/economist, I think gas would be more readily available and, since it is more available, it would be used as an energy source of choice more, and I think that as it is used more and more and would become — using it more — you remember 1978 when Congressman Edward Markey wrote the New York Times? I was a businessman in California, and he said three things in his amazing editorial, and I remember reading it, never knowing I would be in the federal government or out of California. He said, number one:

Interest rates will never again -- the prime rate never again will drop below 20 percent, and he said inflation will never again be out of double digits and natural gas will never be a fuel of any significance in the United States.

/ Wbur

5

He said those three things in an editorial. I clipped it out and stuck it in my scrapbook and read it, and all three of those things were wrong.

So we are not very good at predicting. I think that point is loud and clear.

But when we went out and drilled for increased oil in the '70s after the '73 shock, the '79 shock, I think most of you will admit that we found a lot of natural gas.

The Fuel Use Act was one of the dumbest pieces of legislation to ever come along. I am very happy it is gone, and I hope that the industry appreciates what amount of work went into getting rid of this.

I think Frank mentioned last night that he thinks that the repeal of the Fuel Use Act has increased the use of gas. I don't know if I misheard you or not, Frank. That was basically a premise that it would help the use of more gas.

My own feeling is if we have a treaty in place between the U.S. and Canada that restricts cheap gas being dumped on the U.S. market in the future that it will level the playing field for U.S. industries and it would get more gas available. That is my general reasoning.

I would be interested to hear an opposite opinion if anybody has one.

MR. PITTS: The elimination of the Fuel Use Act I

ፖ Wbur

think has brought about something that could increase our use of natural gas, and we do need it because we have declined usage at the time from 22 trillion cubic feet down to 16 plus trillion.

The elimination -- and one of the reasons for the decrease was that we have not been selling the amount of gas to the electrical industry that we used to sell because of the declining volume. They are big users of natural gas.

I believe we can open up that market now, and I urge all of us, particularly the Energy Department as a leader, to help us condense the energy industry, the electrical industry, that the use of natural gas they should consider seriously and they are, but the -- two big questions, they tell me.

One is supply. They don't have confidence that we can have the reserves in the country to supply them if they invest in a plant.

And, secondly, will the spike come in price and force them not to use it?

They contend that they can use it up to \$4.50 per thousand cubic feet of gas. That gives us pretty good leeway up from what it is now.

I just offer that as a suggestion to our group.

SECRETARY HERRINGTON: I want to be as supportive as we can. We think gas is a very clean, efficient,

P Wbur

1

3

2

5

4

б

7

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

2324

25

environmentally safe fuel, and I want to be able to encourage as much gas use in the United States as I can and also the diversity of fuels. I hate to be hung up on coal or nuclear power, which is struggling now. If we can get gas back into the mix, I think it is the right thing to do.

Ed, I may be out of time.

CHAIRMAN COX: Are there other questions or comments?

VOICE: You talked about your conversations with the Saudis and the continuing reluctance to give them weapons.

Has this affected our relations any?

SECRETARY HERRINGTON: It is hard to be on a confidential basis with half of the Washington press sitting out there.

(Laughter.)

I love these guys.

On an unconfidential basis, they are disappointed -- there is no question -- on our inability to provide them sufficient arms sales to allow them to defend themselves, and I think with good cause. I think we have an obligation to make these weapons sales, and I think too much politics has entered into it. But there is no question that they are frustrated.

A number of the leaders -- I will not mention by

7450 03 03

,r√Wbur

name because it would be in the paper tomorrow -- they sat there and read me comments from the Washington Post and other American papers, New York Times, and said, why is this senator saying that about us?

They don't understand our process and the fact that we are now conducting most of our business in public, and I think that is too bad.

MR. PARKER: Since the press is here, we should keep a perspective, and I know that you identified it, but our dependency on the Middle East oil is much larger. Our allies have a call, and if we are cut off and we do not have a call and we lose much of the other supplies scrambling for the market, I know you are aware of that, but sometimes — we really would miss it if we were cut off. There are too many other people. The allocation that we have worked out in the world today leaves us depending on a very small amount but with the loss of that source of supply it would be a major problem for all of us.

SECRETARY HERRINGTON: I couldn't agree more.

Let me mention if I could for a second, there are two things that struck me during this trip that I think are significant. A number of you are well aware of this, especially in light of the amount of pipeline construction that is going on from Iraq through Turkey, from Iraq through Saudi Arabia into Dubai and out through the different

₽∴Wbur

1 2

3

5

6

7

9

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2425

sources. It is easy to write a scenario today that will see in the early '90s up to 7 million barrels a day moving by pipeline out of the Gulf, which is a fairly secure source.

I think there is a substantial movement away from the Strait of Homuz bottleneck that we see, and I think that is significant, a political change in what we have seen over there heretofore. That is number one.

Number two, most of you know about this and some of you don't, we were briefed in Cudder about the size of the North Dome gas field, the biggest gas field in the world — and it truly is monumental — if that gas can get to market it is going to be a substantial change in the LNG market, in the gas market.

Those of you involved and are interested, I would urge you to get briefed up on the size, the location, and the ramifications of that particular field. They hope to bring it on within two or three years. It is one of the biggest -- in fact the biggest reserve I have ever seen, and I am sure it is the biggest reserve we have ever heard of.

That is it, Ed. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN COX: Thank you, Mr. Secretary. We are indebted to you for being here. We are looking forward to the current projects that we have underway and continuing them and others that you may request from time to time.

P. Wbur

As the Secretary noted, he did request the industry's perspective on how to promote research and development to increase recovery of petroleum already discovered and develop longer range technologies.

To this end, the request calls for the Council to examine the advisability and feasibility of establishing the Petroleum Research Institute. A copy of the Secretary's letter is among the handouts this morning.

Because of the urgency that the Secretary attached to this subject, I exercise the right to -- granted under Section 7-1 of the Articles of Organization -- to proceed with the establishment of a committee to begin preparing a response. With the Secretary's approval, I would form the Committee on the Reserve Institute.

Pete Silas of Phillips has agreed to be the Chairman. The full committee roster has been submitted to the Secretary for his formal approval, and a copy of that roster is also in your folder.

The committee is going to begin immediately, and we will have a report from the committee at our next meeting, at which time there will be a full discussion of the results and conclusions that they reach at that time.

So if there are any questions, we will entertain them at that point.

We also want a report from Bill Swales, if he

ሥ Wbur

will. As you know, he has acted as Chairman of the Petroleum Storage and Transportation, requested by the Secretary at our last meeting, and so he will give us a status report and the schedule for its completion.

Bill.

MR. SWALES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen.

I am pleased to present you this morning a status report on the Petroleum Storage and Transportation Study. As you may recall at our last meeting, we agreed to the Secretary of Energy's request that the National Petroleum Council undertake a comprehensive study updating the Council's petroleum inventory, storage, and transportation capacity reports of 1979 and 1984.

The Secretary requested -- and I quote from his letter:

"Emphasis should be given to
the reexamination of minimum
operating inventory levels,
the location of storage
facilities and availability of
inventories in relationship to
local demand and the capabilities
of distribution networks to move
products from refining centers

pr.Wbur

to their point of consumption, particularly during periods of stress."

The Secretary's complete request letter is appended to the study paper in your packets this morning.

The last time the Council issued a report on all of these areas -- inventory, storage, and transportation capacities -- was in 1979. The inventory and storage capacity portions of that study were updated in the NPC's 1984 report for the Secretary, entitled "Petroleum Inventories and Storage Capacity."

The 1984 report was the tenth report since 1948 prepared by the NPC. The objectives have evolved over time.

The principle objective of the early studies was to determine the total storage capacity of the primary distribution system and the amount of petroleum inventory that could physically be delivered from the system in the even of a military emergency.

In 1974, the Council began focusing on inventories that might be available during nonmilitary emergencies by estimating minimum operating inventories. These minimums, which are significantly higher than the physical minimums, are defined as level of petroleum stocks in primary inventories below which operating problems and spot shortages would begin to appear.

PTWbur

4 5

In 1979, the Council added estimates of inventory and storage capacities in the secondary sector and in '84 included estimates of inventories and storage in the consumer, or tertiary sector.

In his request letter, the Secretary noted that the 1979 and '84 reports are the most current comprehensive treatment of this subject available, although some of the data are now nearly a decade old. The minimum operating inventory levels for resids based on the '83 data are no longer considered valid by the Department of Energy and therefore are no longer referenced in the Energy Information Administration publications.

The petroleum transportation data were compiled in 1978, and as we all know, there have been a number of changes since then in the way the industry transports and distributes crude oil, petroleum products, and natural gas.

To undertake this study, the Council established the Committee on Petroleum Storage and Transportation. I am honored to have Dr. Helmut Merklein, Administrator, Energy Information Administration, as my government Co-Chairman.

Our committee met on September the 30th, 1987, and as one of its first acts established a coordinating subcommittee under the direction of Riad Yammine of Marathon. It will aid in directing the overall study effort and has three task groups -- Liquid Transportation Task

ੂਾ.Wbur

б

Force, chaired by John P. DesBarres, President of Sun Pipeline; the Transportation Task Force chaired by Ronald J. Burns, Executive Vice President, Enron Gas; the Inventory and Storage Task Force, chaired by Bruce V. Frolick, Vice President - Supply and Distribution, Chevron USA, Inc.

Each of these groups have a broad membership which includes representatives of both major and independent petroleum companies, natural gas producers and pipelines, the electric power industry, energy research associations, and academia and consulting committees.

Rosters of these study groups are also attached to the study paper in front of you.

The committee, with the assistance of these groups, will determine physical changes that have occurred in petroleum and gas transportation systems since the 1979 report, emphasizing pipeline and water borne transportation.

It is believed that the other transportation modes, tank cars, tank trucks, do not require separate task groups as in the past and that accurate information may be available from corporations in studies from other sources.

The committee will also update the petroleum inventory and storage data from the 1984 report, including new minimum operating inventory levels for crude oil and the principal petroleum products and estimates for storage capacity and inventory levels in the secondary and consumer

7450 04 04

F. Wbur

sectors.

Natural gas storage will also be studied as part of the gas transportation group effort.

It is expected that most of these data will be collected by survey. The data from these efforts will be examined to determine stress points in the system caused by possible shifts in both supply and demand in the next five years.

The Strategic Petroleum Reserve will also be examined as a source of emergency supply, relying heavily on the Council's 1984 report of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

In addition to these analyses, we will examine changes in the petroleum market due to the various factors, including the expansion of the futures market, changes in the natural gas industry brought about by the regulatory policies changes implemented through the recent FERC orders that move toward a more open marketplace.

The study will also examine the impact of changes in pipeline safety requirements, environmental and other regulations.

Finally, we intend to place much greater emphasis on the dynamics and interrelationship of the petroleum and natural gas supply systems, including the role of changing supply sources, fuel switching, and cogeneration.

*ም*-ጚWbur

At this time I would like to ask for your assistance with the surveys that many of you will be receiving in the spring from the committee. These surveys are essential to the study and, as members of the National Petroleum Council, you have an excellent record of responding to the surveys for past studies.

What I am asking is that you see to it that they are filled out and returned promptly.

The committee has set an ambitious timetable for this study that would result in a final report for your consideration by next winter. The coordinating subcommittee and the task groups will be required to meet frequently over the next year in order to meet the schedule, and I look forward to presenting to you the progress report at our spring meeting and a final report at the winter meeting.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my remarks. Are there any questions?

CHAIRMAN COX: Are there any questions of Bill? (No response.)

CHAIRMAN COX: Thank you very much, and we will be looking forward to getting your other report in the spring. At that time we will also hopefully have our Petroleum Research Study underway and results by then.

We had hoped -- up until I received a call last night -- that Jim Miller of OMB was going to -- hopefully he

איק Wbur

5

was going to be with us today, but unfortunately he called last night during the reception and said because of the pressures on the budget and problems that the Administration is working on right now with Congress that he would not be able to be here. He did express hope that he would be able to be here with us at our next meeting.

So we are sorry that we do not have an opportunity to hear from him today, especially in view of everything that is happening today.

We would like to call right now on John Hall.

John is Chairman of the Finance Committee, and it is people like John, Bill, and all of the others who work on these various task forces and chair these various efforts that make this Council work.

So we are indebted to you, John, and to everyone else for the hours that you spend. Your time is even more important, and it is a pleasure to call on John, who will report from the Finance Committee that met yesterday afternoon.

MR. HALL: Mr. Chairman, members of the Council.

The Finance Committee met yesterday to review the financial status of the Council. We reviewed a draft of the calendar year 1986 audit report from the Council's independent outside auditor, who is Arthur Young and Company, as well as we reviewed expenditures for the first

アエWbur

nine months of the calendar year.

I am pleased to report the financial position of the Council is sound. We are in certificates of deposit, with surplus money.

(Laughter.)

In fact, we expect to end 1987 with a sizable surplus. The surplus is a result of cost cutting and the fact that the majority of the cost of the Petroleum Storage and Transportation Study will be incurred in 1988 instead of late 1987, as budgeted.

We then discussed calendar year 1988 and a recommended budget in the amount of \$1,750,000. This budget includes the funds to complete the Petroleum Storage and Transportation Study and the Petroleum Research Study that we discussed earlier.

Even though this budget is a slight increase over 1987, it is 17 percent lower than three years ago.

The recommendation for member contributions to support the budget will be made at our spring meeting. However, at this time it appears that contributions at the current level will be satisfactory.

Finally, the Finance Committee recommends that Arthur Young and Company continue as our independent public accountants for examination of our 1987 financial statements.

7450 05 05

v1) N (

pr Wbur 1

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

25

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I move that the report of the Finance Committee be approved by the Council.

MR. SWALES: Second.

CHAIRMAN COX: I believe there are two motions, approval of the report and also the approval of Arthur Young as auditors.

All in favor of both of them, say "aye."

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN COX: Opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN COX: We are not supposed to do it that way, but that worked out, I think.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN COX: We referred several times to the spring meeting, and the date has been set, with concurrence of the Secretary, of April 21st. We will have the reception the evening before on the 20th, and you will get further confirmation of that, but so that you can make your calendar dates now we want you to be aware of this.

This brings us to the end of our formal agenda this morning, and next time we hope to have two additional speakers for you in addition to the Secretary, and we are sorry that Director Jim Miller could not be here with us this morning.

We would like to open the meeting for any other

7450 05 05

i no K

P.T.Wbur

matters or any further discussions that anyone might like to bring at this time.

We will limit this not only to members -- we will not limit it just to members of the Council but any of our guests who have -- any non-Council members who would like to make a remark. We would like to hear from them.

Are there any comments or questions?
(No response.)

CHAIRMAN COX: We thank you very much for being here.

There being no further business, we will stand adjourned.)

(Whereupon, at 10:06 a.m., the meeting was adjourned.)

## THE NATIONAL PETROLEUM COUNCIL

I hereby certify that this transcript constitutes an accurate record of the meeting of the National Petroleum Council held on October 28, 1987.

Edwin L. Cox Chairman

76./

Date: December 7, 1987